

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are earnestly, but respectfully requested.

The amended claim and new claims 30-31 find basis in the specification and the original claims. The amended and new claims target two areas: (1) a compound claim (new claim 30), supported by an example in the specification (Sample B) that is distinguishable over the references, and (2) formulation claims 1-10 and 24-29, fuel composition claims 13-17 and 20-23, and process claims 18-19 that incorporate the targeted compound *in conjunction with* unreacted polyalkenes (R constituent), a feature which can contribute to the success of the resultant carrier oil. The amended claims refer to a formulation that contains both a novel polyalkoxylate compound and an unreacted polyalkene constituent, which together contribute to the success of a carrier oil composition. Support for the amended claims providing for this formulation is found in the specification, describing the preparation and subsequent use of Sample B. The formulation of Sample B utilizes the presently claimed compound and unreacted polyalkene, which is preferably polyisobutylene. The presently amended claims now provide for this two-part formulation, as well as a claim for the selection of a particular compound, and the products obtained by the alkoxylation reaction.

Claims 1 and 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,881,945 to Buckley. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 4,881,945 to Buckley. The rejections are traversed. The Office Action acknowledges that the Buckley reference does not teach (and therefore does not disclose) that the R substituent is derived from isobutene and up to about 20 percent by weight of n-butene. It is not seen where the Buckley reference discloses or teaches the formulation claim 1 with its components (i) and (ii). It is also not seen, for instance, where the Buckley reference discloses or would have taught when R and Ar are combined they have a number average molecular weight of 208 as in claim 33. The amended and new claims are novel over the reference and claim 2 would not have been obvious over this reference.

Claims 1-21 and 23-29 were rejected under §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,298,039 to Mohr. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,298,039

Appl. No. 10/046,823
Amdt. dated June 15, 2004
Reply to Office Action of March 15, 2004

to Mohr in view of EP 878532.¹ The rejections are traversed. The reference discloses a two-part combination of polyisobutylamine compounds and alkyl-substituted aromatic alkoxylates, and notably does not disclose polyalkene-substituted aromatic compounds *reacted with* an alkoxylate. In contrast, the compound used in the present application is formed by *reacting* a polyalkene-substituted aromatic compound with an alkoxylate to form a polyalkene aromatic alkoxylate, and further, the claimed formulation can incorporate the unreacted polyalkene components to enhance the success of the overall formulation. The claimed inventions are novel and claim 22 would not have been obvious over the reference.

WO 02/059237, EP 1356012A, and US 6,248,142 have been brought to the attention of the undersigned. These documents were previously cited herein as confirmed by the Examiner's initialed and dated PTO 1449 forms. It is also noted that US 2004/0077507 may be a counterpart to the already considered aforementioned PCT document.

Applicants therefore earnestly but respectfully solicit a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

By: 

Kendrew H. Colton
Registration No. 30,368
Telephone: (202) 419-7000
Facsimile: (202) 419-7007

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
1801 K Street, NW - Suite 401L
Washington, DC 20006-1201

¹ The Office Action itself acknowledges differences from the Mohr reference. According to the Office Action, "Mohr fails to teach that the alkyl group is derived from C₂- to C₂₀ alkenes or is polyisobutyl prepared from isoprene and up to 20 [percent] by weight of n-butene." Moreover, "[i]n a second aspect, Mohr differs from the claims in that he does not specifically teach that the aryl group is cresol or hydrocarbon-substituted cresol." Furthermore, "[i]n the third aspect, Mohr differs from the claims in that he does not specifically teach that the alkylene group of the alkoxylate is 1,4-butylene."